

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 32-35, 37-38 and 41-51 are pending in the application. Claims 32, 35, 41 and 49-51 are amended by the present amendment. Support for the amended claims can be found in the original specification, claims and drawings.¹ No new matter is presented.

In the Office Action, Claims 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101; and Claims 32-35, 37-38, and 41-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Brozowski et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,559,871, herein Brozowski).

The Office Action rejects Claims 49-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, Claims 49-51 are amended to recite “[a] computer-readable medium including a computer program, which when executed by a computer causes the computer to execute an object content structure management method...” Therefore, these claims are amended to recite “a process occurring as a result of executing the program, a machine programmed to operate in accordance with the program ... and a manufacture structurally and functionally interconnected with the program in a manner which enables the program to act as a computer component and realize its functionality”, as noted in the Office Action.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 49-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects Claims 32-35, 37-38, and 41-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Brozowski. In response to this rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 32, 35, 41 and 49-51 recite novel features clearly not disclosed by Brozowski.

¹ e.g., specification, at least at pp. 94-95 and 101-102.

Amended independent Claim 32, for example, recites an object content structure management method for managing a content structure of a root object, wherein

...a plurality of child objects of a same type may be held under a schema definition of types of the child objects capable of being held by the root object; and

a maximum number of the child objects capable of being held are displayed in said tree structure.

Independent Claims 35, 41 and 49-51, while directed to alternative embodiments, are amended to recite similar features. Accordingly, the remarks presented below are applicable to each of amended independent Claims 32, 35, 41 and 49-51.

Turning to the applied primary reference, Brozowski describes an asynchronous tree navigator graphical user interface, which allows a user to asynchronously query for data and display the results of said query.²

Brozowski, however, fails to teach or suggest that “***a maximum number of the child objects capable of being held are displayed in said tree structure***”, as recited in pending independent Claims 32, 35, 41 and 49-51.

In rejecting the previously claimed feature that “one of a maximum number and a minimum number of the child objects capable of being held are displayed in said tree structure”, the Office Action relies on Fig. 2 of Brozowski and asserts that “since the minimum number of child object that can be held is one, that object is displayed on the screen”.

As noted above, however, independent Claims 32, 35, 41 and 49-51 are amended to remove the alternative language regarding the display of a minimum number of child objects, and now recite that “***a maximum number of the child objects capable of being held are displayed in said tree structure***”. Brozowski fails to disclose that his system displays a maximum number of child objects capable of being held, as claimed.

² Brozowski, Abstract.

Application No. 09/965,073
Reply to Office Action of November 28, 2008

Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of independent Claims 32, 35, 41 and 49-51 (and the claims that respectively depend therefrom) under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 32-35, 37-38 and 41-51 is definite and patentably distinguishing over the applied references. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of the application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Andrew T. Harry
Registration No. 56,959

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

I:\ATTY\ATH\PROSECUTION21s\214491-US\214491US - AMD DUE 022809.DOC